

blade material is clad onto a die surface of a cutting die and the blade shaped to form a cutting die blade. In the absence of a disclosure of all elements of a claim, a reference cannot anticipate the claimed invention. The Murphy et al. article further does not disclose heating an area of a die surface and introducing blade material into the heated die surface area to build a blade, nor scanning a laser beam along a die surface in a path corresponding to a desired blade pattern, melting the die surface along said blade pattern path, and introducing cladding powder into said blade pattern path. Because each and every element of claims 1-7, 10 and 12 is not disclosed in the Murphy et al. reference, there can be no anticipation of those claims. Applicant thus respectfully contends that the rejection under § 102 is improper and requests that it be withdrawn.

Applicant further respectfully traverses the rejection under § 103. The Murphy et al. article does not relate to cutting dies and the hardening of blades thereon. Cox et al. does not relate to cladding. There is no teaching, suggestion or motivation within Murphy et al. to apply cladding to cutting dies, and Murphy et al. does not recognize the difficulty inherent in the hardening of a small blade on the surface of a large die body. Thus, one skilled in the art having the Murphy et al. article at hand would not be motivated to look to Cox et al. for a teaching of hardening blades on a cutting die. There is no motivation to combine the references to arrive at the invention of claims 8, 9 and 11. Applicant thus respectfully contends that the rejection under § 103 is improper and requests that it be withdrawn.

Applicant had added by this amendment new claims 20-27. The new claims relate to the formation of blades on a cutting die surface by cladding in which successive layers of blade material are deposited one upon another onto the die surface, followed by shaping the

cladded blade to form a cutting die blade. Support for the new claims is found on page 7, lines 16-17 and page 15, lines 17-20. Applicant believes the claims as submitted are allowable over the art of record.

In view of the foregoing amendments to the claims and remarks given herein, applicant respectfully believes this case is in condition for allowance and respectfully requests allowance of the pending claims. If the Examiner believes any detailed language of the claims requires further discussion, the Examiner is respectfully asked to telephone the undersigned attorney so that the matter may be promptly resolved. The Examiner's prompt attention to this matter is appreciated.

Applicants are of the opinion that an additional fee of \$366.00 is due as a result of this amendment. A check for \$366.00 is submitted herewith. If any additional charges or credits are necessary to complete this communication, please apply them to deposit account no. 23-3000.

Respectfully submitted,

WOOD, HERRON & EVANS, L.L.P.

By:


Kristi L. Davidson
Reg. No. 44,643

2700 Carew Tower
Cincinnati, OH 45202
(513) 241-2324 (voice)
(513) 421-7269 (facsimile)

K:\BERL\18A\response.wpd